

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 9-11, 12, and 15 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

### **Specification Objections**

A substitute abstract is attached as an appendix.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 9-11 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1 and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number (USPN) 6,885,745 to Handforth et al. (“Handforth”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the cited reference must teach every element of the claim. *See e.g.*, MPEP § 2131, for example.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “wherein an invalid power status indicates detection of a power interruption from one or more power supplies.”

Independent claim 15 has been amended to recite “isolating said component signal at said switch in accordance with said power status signal upon detection of a power interruption from one or more power supplies to one or more components.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Handforth fails to disclose all the features recited in amended claims 1 and 15. Rather, Handforth is directed to providing an improved voltage and current protection arrangement for a line circuit in the event of a “fault condition, such as an over-current or over-voltage condition that could affect the telephone service being provided to the telephone service subscriber.” See e.g., col. 2, lines 20-53.

In view of the above, Handforth clearly fails to teach or suggest detection of a power interruption as recited in independent claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection with respect to independent claims 1 and 15 and claims 16-18, which depend from independent claim 15.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 6,175,490 to Papa et al. (“Papa”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 7 has been amended to recite “said management module comprises an isolation circuit to isolate said signals upon detection of a power interruption from one or more power supplies to one of said shelf components.”

As admitted by the Examiner “Papa is silent on the detailed operation of Papa’s isolating switches.”

In view of the above, Papa clearly fails to teach or suggest isolation of signals upon detection of a power interruption from one or more power supplies to a shelf component. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection with respect to independent claim 7.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 2-4, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Handforth. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

According to MPEP § 2143, three basic criteria must be met to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). *See* MPEP 706.02(j). Furthermore, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. *See e.g.*, MPEP § 2143.03.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “wherein an invalid power status indicates detection of a power interruption from one or more power supplies.”

Independent claim 15 has been amended to recite “isolating said component signal at said switch in accordance with said power status signal upon detection of a power interruption from one or more power supplies to one or more components.”

Applicant submits that Handforth fails to teach or suggest all the features recited in amended independent claims 1 and 15. As mentioned above, to form a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the cited reference or references when combined, must teach or suggest every element of the claim. *See e.g.*, MPEP § 2143.03. Therefore, Handforth is

insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to amended independent claims 1 and 15. Applicant submits that claims 2-4, 19, and 20 are allowable for at least this reason. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection with respect to claims 2-4, 19, and 20.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Handforth in view of USPN 7,026,646 to Cowles et al. (“Cowles”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “wherein an invalid power status indicates detection of a power interruption from one or more power supplies.” Applicant submits that neither Handforth nor Cowles teaches or suggests all the features recited in amended independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 6 are allowable for at least this reason.

As recited above, to form a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the cited references when combined, must teach or suggest every element of the claim. *See e.g.*, MPEP § 2143.03. In the Office Action, Cowles was relied upon to teach “normally open logic” and “an N-channel MOSFET used in isolation.”

As such, even if Handforth could be combined with Cowles, which Applicant does not admit, such combination would still fail to teach or suggest all of the features of amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Handforth and Cowles, whether alone or in combination, are insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection with respect to claims 5 and 6.

Claims 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papa in view of Handforth. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 7 has been amended to recite “said management module comprises an isolation circuit to isolate said signals upon detection of a power interruption from one or more power supplies to one of said shelf components.” Applicant submits that neither Papa nor Handforth teaches or suggests all the features recited in amended independent claim 7. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8-11 are allowable for at least this reason.

As mentioned above, to form a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the cited references when combined, must teach or suggest every element of the claim. *See e.g.*, MPEP § 2143.03. As such, even if Papa could be combined with Handforth, which Applicant does not admit, such combination would still fail to teach or suggest all of the features of amended independent claim 7. Therefore, Papa and Handforth, whether alone or in combination, are insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to amended independent claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection with respect to claims 8-11.

Claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Handforth in view of USPN 6,789,871 to Edelen et al. (“Edelen”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 12 has been amended to recite “wherein a TTL logic low power status signal indicates detection of a power interruption from one or more power supplies.” Applicant submits that neither Handforth nor Edelen teaches or suggests all

the features recited in amended independent claim 12. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12-14 are allowable for at least this reason.

As mentioned above, to form a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the cited references when combined, must teach or suggest every element of the claim. *See e.g.*, MPEP § 2143.03. In the Office Action, Edelen was relied upon to teach “dual channel MOSFETS.” As such, even if Handforth could be combined with Edelen, which Applicant does not admit, such combination would still fail to teach or suggest all of the features of amended independent claim 12. Therefore, Handforth and Edelen, whether alone or in combination, are insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to amended independent claim 12. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection with respect to claims 12-14.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-20 recite novel features not shown by the cited references. Furthermore, Applicant submits that claims 1-20 are non-obvious and represent patentable subject matter in view of the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims 1-20 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references. Moreover, Applicant submits that the above-recited novel features provide new and unexpected results not recognized by the cited references.

Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action’s rejection with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims

Appl. No. 10/722,853  
Response Dated August 28, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of April 28, 2006

that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

It is believed that claims 1-20 are in allowable form. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 724-933-9344 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC



---

Robert V. Racunas, Reg. No. 43,027  
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: August 28, 2006

4500 Brooktree Road, Suite 102  
Wexford, PA 15090  
(724) 933-5529

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being eFiled with the United States Patent and Trademark Office:

Date of Submission: August 28, 2006

Filed By: Robert Vincent Racunas/ Deborah Higham